



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The logic of M. Demangeon's position is that the advanced imperialistic nations ought to recognize the fact that international wars for control are worse than useless and they should further unite on a policy of general guardianship of the backward countries with the central idea that just so soon as the natives are desirous of going it alone they should be permitted to do so. But Frenchmen are not much given to such moralizing and we have nothing of the sort here; but he does clearly state that the imperialistic game for Europe is pretty well played out and the best thing for France to do, at least, is to spend more of her capital and energy in domestic development and gradually put aside her agelong imperialistic ambitions. This is a bit of advice which every well-wisher of France hopes M. Demangeon's fellow countrymen will follow.

B. B. KENDRICK,  
*Columbia University.*

*The Folly of Nations.* FREDERICK PALMER. New York, Dodd Mead and Company, 1921. 408 pages.

Frederick Palmer has seen war at first hand since 1897, when his career as war correspondent began in the rather old fashioned, glamorous Turko-Grecian struggle. He says he thought it folly at the time. His pictures of the old peasant, trying to get his sheep out of range of the guns, gives us the key idea of the book. This shepherd looked upon war as a sort of "act of God"—something which just came, like earthquakes and pestilences. We get the impression that the author attributes a goodly portion of the responsibility to men—men of the ilk of the pot-bellied, platitudinous Greek Deputy, who stirred up the hornets' nest from a safe distance. If this is so, we have something tangible on which to work—both the Deputy and the simple-minded people who listen to him.

The discussion of the "McAndrew's Epoch"—the imperialistic period which discovered the "white man's burden," made some small wars of organized against unorganized peoples, and paved the way for the tragedy of 1914—is rather tedious reading. In this and the following chapter on "The World's Sore Spots," the author mixes telling accounts of what he saw himself with intelligent but over-long reflections on the significance of these experiences and prosy meandering through ideas evidently derived from books. The disgraceful pillaging and disorder accompanying the Powers' invasion of China to put down

the Boxer uprising may be news to some readers. The analysis of the Filipino attitude toward compulsory occidentalization is extremely well done and evidently comes from the sources. It is genuinely astonishing how few people have ever been exposed to the idea that the "backwardness" of less developed lands and the "advancement" of the industrialized occident are merely different but complementary aspects of the same thing. If we make these groups like ourselves, our exploitation of them must cease—which would change our civilization almost as much as theirs.

War has a lure for young men, especially for those who have never seen it. Old men and rotten politics easily drag these youngsters into it. Those who endure the tragedy, suffering and dirt of the actual campaigns are made to believe lies about the enemy. Wild abortions of philosophy convince them that the aims, if not the process, are noble, moral and religious—otherwise they could not endure to the end, having quickly found out how beastly and intolerable war is. In the peace, these young men are betrayed. Then a new generation, seeing the shining lure, believing the world-old lies and not understanding the horror and destruction, are led to a new war.

It is impossible even to sketch here Mr. Palmer's ideas of what is required to nail the lies, to dissipate the delusions and misunderstandings, which lead to war. Jejune nationalism is bad. We must have an international organization to curb it. Mr. Palmer has a faith in the League of Nations which many of his readers will not share. The remedy for war really boils down to education. If people generally are kept properly informed about war and its effects, they will be skeptical. The atrocity stories about the Germans were mostly false, as were their atrocity stories about us. Terrible things happen on both sides of such a brutal argument. The very first German prisoner the Americans took was murdered—stabbed to death after he had surrendered. The censor—Colonel Palmer in this case—could not allow this to get to the people. Ordinary Americans might be frenzied by war propaganda beyond the capacity for moral judgment, but some would certainly object. And what would neutrals think? What sort of propaganda would Germany erect on such a fact, to bolster up her own morale? Lying is as inseparable from war as from stealing.

The literary style of this book lacks the beauty and force which made Gibbs' *Now it Can be Told* such an epic of the vast

tragedy. As a demonstration of the physical absurdity of war, Irwin's *The Next War* is clearer, more lucid and more convincing. Yet Colonel Palmer attempts something more than either. His is rather a treatment of war in the abstract, with illustrations here and there from his wide experience. "Dear, grave old Palmer, with sphinx-like face and honest soul," as his friend Gibbs characterizes him, has given us the philosophy of a thoughtful lifetime in touch with his subject. It is heavy in spots, but it is tremendous in others.

Someone must map out the conventional beliefs of the war period, the armistice period and the post-war disillusionment, getting these into proper relationship with each other. The time of disenchantment in which we find ourselves has its own catchwords and slogans. It "leans over backward," so to speak. In this respect, *The Folly of Nations* is less faulty than most of the others.

M. M. KNIGHT,  
*Columbia University.*

*The Question of the Aborigines in the Law and Practice of Nations.*

ALPHEUS HENRY SNOW. New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1921. 376 pp.

This book fills a gap in our legal literature. It is a reprint, by permission, of material collected in 1918 by a prominent attorney and author, of Washington, D. C., at the request of the Department of State. So commonly have the dealings of civilized states with native peoples been looked upon as purely private affairs that these relations have not been dealt with to any extent by legal authorities, and Mr. Snow found "no treatise on the question, nor even any chapters in any book on international law or the law of colonies, to serve as a model or a guide."

Indeed, there is considerable ground for questioning the legal nature of the customs which have prevailed in the dealings of the various states with their aborigines, except in so far as the interests of more than one civilized state have been involved at one and the same time. There has always been diversity of opinion among the authorities, even on such questions as that of the validity of treaties executed between a civilized state and native tribes. In the early days of our government Chief Justice Marshall made his famous decision in which he classed the Indian tribes within our borders as "domestic dependent nations;" and prior to 1871 our government repeatedly solemnized treaties with